The New World Translation Under Examination

A Critical-Investigative Analysis Based on Its Own Documents,

INTRODUCTION

This study begins from a simple position: that of someone who reads the Holy Scriptures carefully and wants to understand what is written. By personal choice, I do not belong to any religious denomination, and I do not write as a defender of any specific tradition.

Curiosity led me to the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures (NWT). It is presented by its users, especially by Jehovah's Witnesses, as a translation faithful to the original languages and free of traditional doctrinal influences. That kind of claim cannot be accepted or dismissed without examination. It needs to be verified.
This study was not designed to support or attack a denomination, nor to defend an alternative theological position. Its purpose is to investigate, with method and depth, what is taught, published, and affirmed — both in the biblical text and in the explanatory and doctrinal materials associated with it. The focus is not on reaching quick conclusions, but on following the path of evidence in its entirety.
The investigation will follow a progressive method, organized into three consecutive blocks, built cumulatively. Each stage prepares the next. It must therefore be made clear from the outset: skipping stages undermines the understanding of the whole. This is not a fragmented investigation, but a continuous logical progression.

From the beginning, a few rules of intellectual honesty toward the reader must be made explicit. They govern the entire investigation from start to finish:

1. No conclusion will be presented as personal opinion.
2. Every factual claim, textual quotation, or doctrinal description will be accompanied by a verifiable source, preferably with a direct link to the original material.
3. The reader will not be asked to trust the author, but invited to verify each step independently.
4. There will be no accusatory language, nor attribution of bad faith. The method will always be descriptive, analytical, and logical.
5. Other biblical translations and external theological systems will not be used as a standard of correction or as a comparative basis for the New World Translation. When other translations are mentioned, it will only be in a historical-documentary context. The analysis remains, from beginning to end, within the internal coherence of the NWT and the theological system that uses it.

With these rules established, the investigation can proceed in a controlled manner. The first block examines whether the New World Translation contradicts itself in its own statements throughout the Scriptures, or maintains internal consistency. The

second block deepens that analysis by examining attributes of nature — not merely of function — assigned exclusively to Jehovah and applied to Jesus within the same translation. The third block examines the organization's authority structure, its prophetic claim, the history of its dated predictions, the historical origin of the NWT, and the doctrinal teachings that have direct and verifiable consequences in the lives of its members.

The conclusion belongs to the reader.

BLOCK 1

External Functions and Prerogatives of Jehovah in the NWT

What he does — actions and functions attributed exclusively to Jehovah and exercised by Jesus

"Creator of All Things"

Jehovah's Declaration: Isaiah 44:24 (NWT)

> *"This is what Jehovah says, your Repurchaser, who formed you from the womb: 'I am Jehovah, who made everything. I stretched out the heavens by myself, and I spread out the earth. Who was with me?'"*

Here, Jehovah presents the act of creation as exclusive, absolute, and unshared. The creation of "everything" is tied directly to his identity, without the participation of any other independent agent.

Statements about Jesus: John 1:1–3 (NWT)

> *"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god. This one was in the beginning with God. All things came into existence through him, and apart from him not even one thing came into existence."*

The formulation of John 1:3 is twofold and deliberately emphatic. The first statement establishes totality: all things came into existence through the Word. The second eliminates any possible exception: apart from him not even one thing came into existence. The text leaves no room for intermediate categories.

Colossians 1:15–17 (NWT)

> *"He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; because by means of him all other things were created... All other things were created through him and for him."*

Even with the interpretive insertion of the word "other," the NWT assigns to Jesus a creative role that Isaiah describes as exclusive to Jehovah. In the 1984 English edition of the NWT, such insertions appeared in brackets [ ], indicating they were not in the original text. Verifiable in the official introduction of that edition at:
Introduction — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
The word 'other' in Colossians 1:16 is one of those insertions. The organization itself therefore acknowledges that it is not in the original text — it was inserted to supplement the meaning. The insertion is not neutral: it transforms an absolute statement into one with an implicit exclusion, altering the logical category of the sentence. What the Greek text says without that word is different from what it says with it.

In John 1:3, the statement is absolute: not only did all things come into existence through him, but not even one thing came into existence apart from him. In Colossians 1:16–17, the creation is restricted to "all other things," which implies that

Jesus would not belong to the set of things he himself created. Both formulations cannot be simultaneously true in the same sense.

"Proverbs 8:22 — The System's Foundational Verse"

Proverbs 8:22 (NWT)

> *"Jehovah produced me as the beginning of his way, the earliest of his achievements of long ago."*

The NWT applies this verse to Jesus, identifying him as Jehovah's first creation. This identification is recorded in an official publication of the organization itself. Verifiable at: Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This fact creates a direct tension with John 1:3, already examined: if Jesus is Jehovah's first creation, then he belongs to the set of created things. But John 1:3 states that not even one thing came into existence apart from him. Both statements cannot be true at the same time.

There is an additional tension this verse creates with Isaiah 44:24, where Jehovah declares that he stretched out the heavens "by myself" and asks "who was with me?" If Jesus existed as the first creation before all others, he was present during the creation — which is in direct conflict with Jehovah's declaration that no one was with him. The text offers no resolution to this internal tension.

"Judging All of Humanity"

Prerogative Attributed to Jehovah: Isaiah 33:22 (NWT)

> *"For Jehovah is our Judge, Jehovah is our Lawgiver, Jehovah is our King; he is the one who will save us."*

Genesis 18:25 (NWT)

> *"It is unthinkable for you to act in this manner... Will not the Judge of all the earth do what is right?"*

Judging all of humanity is presented as a direct prerogative of Jehovah.

Jesus Exercising the Same Function: John 5:22–23 (NWT)

> *"For the Father judges no one at all, but he has entrusted all the judging to the Son, so that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father."*

The text states clearly: the Father judges no one; all judgment has been entrusted to the Son; the Son must receive the same honor as the Father. The logical tension is inevitable: a prerogative presented as absolute for Jehovah is exercised in full by Jesus.

Transitional Note
The verses examined in this block describe actions and functions — creating, judging. In principle, functions can be delegated. That argument exists and will be considered. But there is a different category of attributes: those that do not describe what Jehovah does, but what he is. Attributes of nature, not of function. These

cannot be delegated without the very concept of identity ceasing to make sense. That is the category Block 2 examines.

BLOCK 2

Exclusive Internal Attributes of Jehovah in the NWT

What he is — attributes of nature assigned exclusively to Jehovah and applied to Jesus
methodological note:
Isaiah 42:8 (NWT)

> *"I am Jehovah. That is my name; I give my glory to no one else, nor my praise to graven images."*

This declaration is not functional. It does not say that Jehovah does not delegate functions. It says he does not share his glory. What is examined in this block is whether the NWT itself upholds that exclusivity or presents tension with it.

"The First and the Last"

Jehovah's Declaration: Isaiah 44:6 (NWT)

> *"This is what Jehovah says, the King of Israel and his Repurchaser, Jehovah of armies: 'I am the first and I am the last. Apart from me there is no God.'"*

Jesus' Declaration: Revelation 1:17–18 (NWT)

> *"Do not be afraid. I am the First and the Last, and the living one, and I became dead, but look! I am living forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and of the Grave."*

The text unambiguously identifies the speaker: Jesus, the one who died and returned to life. The same title that Jehovah declared as exclusive — directly tied to the assertion that there is no other God apart from him — is applied to Christ.

"Alpha and Omega"

Revelation 21:6 (NWT)

> *"And he said to me: 'It has come to pass! I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end.'"*

The context of verses 5 through 7 of chapter 21 identifies the speaker as the one seated on the throne. The reader is invited to verify directly at:
Revelation 21 — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
Revelation 22:12–16 (NWT)

> *"'Look! I am coming quickly... I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end... I, Jesus, sent my angel to bear witness to you...'"*

The immediate context clearly identifies the speaker as Jesus. The same absolute title is applied to him without qualification.

"Eternity and Immutability"

Jehovah's Attribute: Psalm 102:25–27 (NWT)

> *"Há muito tempo lançaste os alicerces da terra... Eles perecerão, mas tu permanecerás... Mas tu és o mesmo, e os teus anos não acabarão."*

Direct Application to Jesus: Hebrews 1:3–12 (NWT)

> *"He is the reflection of God's glory and the exact representation of his very being... After he had made a purification for our sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. So he has become better than the angels, just as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs... In the beginning, O Lord, you laid the foundations of the earth... They will perish, but you will remain... But you are the same, and your years will never come to an end."*

O versículo 3 merece atenção antes de qualquer coisa. A expressão "representação exata do seu próprio ser" traduz o termo grego *kharaktêr*, verifiable directly in the organization's own official interlinear:
https://www.jw.org/en/library/bible/kingdom-interlinear-greek-translation/
Kharaktêr descreve uma impressão idêntica à sua matriz, como um selo que reproduz com exatidão aquilo de que é marca. Não é linguagem de semelhança aproximada, nem de criatura feita à imagem de outra. É uma linguagem de identidade de natureza.
Here a direct tension arises with the organization's own official teaching. The same Watchtower that translates Jesus as "the exact representation of God's very being" in Hebrews 1:3 also publishes:
"Jesus Cristo é o arcanjo Miguel." — A Sentinela, 1º de abril de 2010. Verifiable at:
https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/revistas/wp20100401/Jesus-é-o-arcanjo-Miguel/
A pergunta que esse cruzamento coloca não é teológica. É estritamente textual: em que momento das Escrituras, dentro da própria TNM, um anjo é descrito como "a representação exata do ser de Deus"?
A resposta, verificável pelo próprio leitor no texto da TNM, é: nunca. Anjos são descritos como servos, mensageiros e seres criados. Nenhum deles recebe a linguagem de *kharaktêr* aplicada ao Filho em Hebreus 1:3. A organização usa essa linguagem para Jesus e simultaneamente identifica Jesus como anjo, sem explicar como as duas afirmações coexistem dentro do mesmo sistema textual.

The author of Hebrews then applies to Jesus the text of Psalm 102 which, in the Old Testament, refers explicitly to Jehovah. Verifiable at:
https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/58/1
Há ainda a variável tradutória de Hebreus 1:8. A frase pode ser lida como "Deus é o teu trono" ,opção da TNM, ou como "O teu trono, ó Deus, é para todo o sempre", leitura em que o Filho é chamado diretamente de Deus pelo Pai. O leitor que acessar o link de referência da própria organização encontrará o argumento deles para essa escolha. Vale observar, porém, dois pontos que emergem do próprio texto:
First, the immediately following verse — Hebrews 1:9 (NWT) — continues the same quotation with the words: *"por isso Deus, o teu Deus, te ungiu"*. The text there distinguishes two subjects: "God" and "your God." If the Son is not called God in verse 8, verse 9 loses syntactic coherence — there would be no reason to distinguish "God" from "your God" if the Son had not previously been identified as such.

Second, the organization argues that Hebrews 1:8 quotes Psalm 45, originally addressed to a human king of Israel, and that therefore the language does not imply actual divinity. This argument has weight and deserves acknowledgment. The organization itself, in the reference link cited below, quotes scholar B. F. Westcott in support of that reading. In the original published by the Watchtower, Westcott is quoted as follows:

"It is difficult to think that Elohim in the original was addressed to the king... On the whole, therefore, it seems best to adopt the rendering in the first clause: God is thy throne (or, thy throne is God), i.e., 'Thy kingdom is founded on God.'"

Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1984169

This is a serious academic argument, supported by a source that this very investigation has already acknowledged as relevant. An honest analysis cannot ignore it.

However, the argument faces an internal difficulty posed by the NWT text itself: if the quotation of Psalm 45 is only honorific language for a human king, without implying divine nature, it does not prove the superiority of Jesus over angels — which is the only argument Hebrews 1 is building. The entire chapter is a progressive demonstration that Jesus is superior to the angels. If the citations used are merely honorific and say nothing about nature, the argument in Hebrews fails at its own purpose. The text only works as a demonstration if the citations say something real about who Jesus is.

The textual debate over Hebrews 1:8 can be verified in the organization's own publication at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1984169

A Note Worth Recording

The organization cites B. F. Westcott in support of its reading of Hebrews 1:8. This is a legitimate methodological choice — Westcott is a weighty scholar, and his analysis deserves serious consideration. This investigation acknowledges that.

But precisely for that reason, what Westcott wrote about other central verses deserves equal weight. In the same commentary on the Gospel of John, publicly available at Archive.org, Westcott recorded his position on John 1:1, the most central verse in the debate over the identity of Jesus:

"The predicate (God) stands emphatically first... It is necessarily without the article inasmuch as it describes the nature of the Word and does not identify His Person... No idea of inferiority of nature is suggested by the form of expression, which simply affirms the true deity of the Word."

B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/TheGospelAccordingToSt.JohnTheGreekTextWithIntroductionAndNotes

In plain terms: Westcott states that the absence of the article in John 1:1 does not indicate inferiority of nature — it describes the nature of the Word, and the expression affirms the true deity of the Logos.

The question this data raises is strictly methodological: if Westcott's argument is valid and worthy of citation in Hebrews 1:8, his analysis of John 1:1 deserves the same treatment. An academic source cannot be authoritative only where it is convenient. Citing Westcott selectively — where he supports the doctrine — and ignoring him where he contradicts it is the same pattern already identified in this investigation in the case of Benjamin Kedar-Kopf.

The reader can verify both documents and decide for themselves.

"Knowing Hearts"

Jehovah's Exclusivity: Jeremiah 17:10 (NWT)

> *"I, Jehovah, am searching the heart, examining the innermost thoughts, to give to each one according to his ways."*

Attribute Exercised by Jesus: Revelation 2:18–23 (NWT)

> *"'These are the things that the Son of God says... all the congregations will know that I am the one who searches the innermost thoughts and hearts, and I will give to each one of you according to your deeds.'"*

Jesus himself claims a function that the Old Testament attributes exclusively to Jehovah. The language is not approximate — it is identical.

"The Source of Life"

Jehovah's Declared Exclusivity: Psalm 36:9 (NWT)

> *"For with you is the source of life; by your light we can see light."*

The Same Attribute Applied to Jesus: John 5:26 (NWT)

> *"For just as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted also to the Son to have life in himself."*

The text establishes a direct equivalence of attribute: just as the Father has life in himself, the Son has life in himself. The usual interpretive escape is the word "granted." But that solution does not resolve the problem — it merely shifts it. The question is not whether or not a granting took place. The question is what was granted. The text does not say the Father grants life to the Son, which would be expected for any creature that receives life from an external source. The text says the Father granted to the Son to have life in himself: the possession of the same attribute Jehovah possesses. After this granting, the Son is not described as dependent on anything. He comes to have life in himself — exactly the same formulation used for Jehovah. Creatures do not have life in themselves; they receive life. John 5:26 does not use that language for the Son.

"Worship Directed at the Son"

The NWT itself establishes that faithful spiritual creatures refuse worship:
Revelation 22:8–9 (NWT)

> *"I fell down to worship at the feet of the angel who had been showing me these things. But he tells me: 'Be careful! Do not do that!... I am only a fellow slave of yours... Worship God.'"*

The angel explicitly refuses and redirects worship. When the same gesture is directed at Jesus, the pattern changes:

Matthew 28:9 (NWT)

> *"They approached and took hold of his feet and did obeisance to him."*

No correction is made.

The Greek word used in these contexts is proskuneo. The NWT translates this same term differently depending on context — in some cases as "worship," in others as "obeisance." The reader is invited to verify the original terms in the NWT interlinear available at: https://www.jw.org/en/library/bible/kingdom-interlinear-greek-translation/
John 20:28–29 (NWT)

> *"Em resposta, Tomé lhe disse: 'Meu Senhor e meu Deus!' Jesus lhe disse: 'Porque você me viu, você acreditou? Felizes os que não viram, mas mesmo assim acreditaram.'"*

The exact meaning of Thomas's words is genuinely debated, and an honest investigation acknowledges that. Some argue the expression was honorific language, or that it was directed to the Father through Jesus, or that it reflected the emotional impact of the moment without precise doctrinal implication. Those arguments exist and deserve to be acknowledged.

However, the immediate context of the NWT text itself limits the reach of those interpretations. John 20:26–28 records that Jesus was physically present in the room. Thomas saw Jesus, was invited to touch his hands and his side, and then said "My Lord and my God" directly to him. The text leaves no ambiguity about the immediate recipient of those words — they were spoken to Jesus, in person, after direct physical contact. The suggestion that Thomas was addressing the Father through Jesus would require the text to indicate such mediation. It does not.

What the NWT text records unambiguously, however, is not what Thomas meant, but Jesus's behavior in the face of those words: no correction, no redirection, no distinction. The pattern already established by the NWT itself is clear: in Revelation 22:8–9, a faithful angel immediately interrupts a gesture of prostration and says "Worship God." Jesus, confronted with words even more direct than a gesture, does not do the same. This contrast in behavior is in the NWT text and does not depend on interpreting what Thomas meant. It is an observable fact that remains unexplained within the textual system itself.

"Jesus as the Archangel Michael — The Internal Implications"

The Organization of Jehovah's Witnesses officially teaches that Jesus Christ is the archangel Michael:
"Jesus Christ is the archangel Michael." — The Watchtower, April 1, 2010. Verifiable at: https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/revistas/wp20100401/Jesus-é-o-arcanjo-Miguel/
"The Bible indicates that Michael is another name for Jesus Christ, both before and after his life on earth." — What Does the Bible Really Teach?, chap. 11. Verifiable at: https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/livros/biblia-ensina/quem-e-o-arcanjo-miguel-jesus/
"The biblical evidence indicates that the name Michael applied to God's Son before he left heaven." — Insight on the Scriptures, vol. 2, pp. 393–394. Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1200003035

This identification, cross-referenced with the textual data already recorded, generates five tensions that the NWT text itself does not resolve:

Tension 1 — Angels refuse worship. Jesus, identified as an angel, does not.
The NWT has already made clear, in Revelation 22:8–9, that faithful angels refuse worship and explicitly redirect it to God. This pattern is consistent with the nature of a creature: it does not accept what belongs exclusively to the Creator. If Jesus is the archangel Michael — and therefore an angel — the same behavior should apply to him. But the data already examined shows the opposite: in Matthew 28:9, Jesus receives prostration without making any correction. In John 20:28, he receives the declaration "My Lord and my God" and responds only by commending Thomas's faith, without redirecting worship to Jehovah. The pattern of faithful angels does not apply to Jesus within the NWT itself.

Tension 2 — Michael acts with limited authority. Jesus receives total authority of judgment.
Jude 9 (NWT) records that Michael, when confronting Satan himself, did not dare to pronounce judgment on his own and said: "May Jehovah rebuke you." The text is explicit: Michael did not act on his own authority. He deferred judgment to Jehovah. That is the expected behavior of a creature before a prerogative that belongs exclusively to the Creator. But John 5:22 (NWT) states: "For the Father judges no

one at all, but he has entrusted all the judging to the Son." A being who, when confronting Satan, does not dare to pronounce judgment on his own and defers that prerogative to Jehovah, cannot be the same being to whom all authority of judgment over humanity has been entrusted. The two descriptions do not describe the same agent with the same nature.

Tension 3 — Michael is a creature. John 1:3 requires that the Word not be created.
Se Jesus é Miguel, e Miguel é uma criatura angélica, por mais elevada que seja sua posição, então Jesus pertence ao conjunto das coisas criadas. Mas João 1:3 (TNM) afirma que not even one thing veio à existência à parte da Palavra. Como demonstrado no Bloco 1, essa formulação exige, por necessidade lógica, que a Palavra não seja criada: criar a si mesmo é logicamente impossível, e o texto afirma que nada existe fora da mediação da Palavra. Um ser criado não pode ser o mediador universal da criação sem que a afirmação de João 1:3 perca completamente seu sentido. As duas posições, Jesus é Miguel, uma criatura, e Jesus é a Palavra, mediador universal de toda criação, são mutuamente excludentes dentro da própria TNM.

Tension 4 — Angels receive life. Jesus has life in himself.
John 5:26 (NWT) states that the Son has life in himself — the same formulation used to characterize Jehovah as the source of life. As recorded in Block 2, this is a statement about nature, not function. Creatures do not have life in themselves; they receive life. Angels are creatures. Therefore, if Jesus is an angel, he cannot have life in himself in the sense John 5:26 describes. But the NWT asserts exactly that, using the same language applied to Jehovah, without qualification or distinction. The text does not say the Son continuously receives life — it says he possesses life in himself. This assertion is incompatible with the nature of an angelic creature.

Tension 5 — The very meaning of the name creates an internal question.
The organization records that the name Michael means "Who is like God?" — a rhetorical question which, in the Hebrew context, means: no one.
Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1200003035
But the NWT itself applies to Jesus the titles that Isaiah 44:6 ties to Jehovah's exclusive identity: "I am the first and I am the last. Apart from me there is no God." The being whose name asks "who is like God?" receives, within the same translation, the titles that define who God is.

Final Investigative Note of Block 2
The NWT explicitly declares, in Isaiah 42:8, that Jehovah does not share his glory with anyone else. The investigation records the pattern: the same translation systematically assigns to Jesus the titles, attributes, and prerogatives that define that glory — without correction, without qualification, without categorical distinction. The question this pattern raises is strictly logical and will serve as the entry point of Block 3.

All cited verses are available for direct verification at:
Bible — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

BLOCK 3

From Texts to Authorities: The Analysis of Official Teachings

Up to this point, the investigation has focused on the text of the New World Translation itself. Once recurring tensions have been identified, the next step is not to repeat them indefinitely, but to ask why those tensions are sustained, how they are officially explained, and what else the organization teaches, publishes, and affirms — including doctrines with direct and verifiable consequences in the lives of its members.

Biblical texts do not exist in isolation. They are read, taught, and interpreted within concrete institutional structures. It is at that level that it is determined who governs whom: whether the text governs the doctrine or the doctrine governs the text.

The Watchtower's Prophetic Claim Under Its Own Biblical Criterion

The Organization of Jehovah's Witnesses itself has claimed, in official publications, the role of God's collective "prophet" on earth:

> *"This 'prophet' was not one man, but a body of men and women. It was the small group of footstep followers of Jesus Christ, known at that time as International Bible Students. Today they are known as Jehovah's Christian Witnesses."*

verificável em ‘Saberão que houve um profeta no seu meio’ — BIBLIOTECA ON-LINE da Torre de Vigia

This self-declaration completely alters the methodological weight of its interpretations. When an institution claims prophetic authority, its interpretive failures cease to be mere human mistakes and begin to require examination in the light of the very criterion it claims to accept as normative.

Deuteronomy 18:22 (NWT)

> ***"When the prophet speaks in the name of Jehovah and the word is not fulfilled or does not come true, then Jehovah did not speak that word."***

This will be exactly the criterion applied below — not by external imposition, but out of fidelity to the biblical standard that the Watchtower itself recognizes, explains, and applies to others.

Documented Chronology of Dated Predictions

1914
Before 1914, the Watchtower taught that that year would mark the definitive end of human governments:

> *"The 'battle of the great day of God Almighty' (Revelation 16:14) will end in A.D. 1914 with the complete overthrow of earth's present rulership."*

Studies in the Scriptures, vol. 2, 1914 edition, p. 101. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/studies-in-the-scriptures-vol.2-the-time-is-at-hand-edition-1914

The organization stated that this date was not subject to revision:

> *"We see no reason for changing the figures — nor could we change them if we would. They are, we believe, God's dates, not ours."*
>
> ***Direct translation:*** *"Não vemos motivo para alterar os números — e nem poderíamos alterá-los mesmo que quiséssemos. Eles são, acreditamos, as datas de Deus, não as nossas."*

Zion's Watch Tower, July 15, 1894, p. 226. Verifiable at: 1894 Zion's Watch Tower : Watchtower Bible and Tract Society : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

The events announced for 1914 did not occur as described.

1915 and 1918
After 1914 failed to match what had been announced, the date was adjusted to 1915 in later editions of the same work. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/studies-in-the-scriptures-vol.2-the-time-is-at-hand-edition-1914

In 1917, the organization taught that God would destroy the churches and their members in 1918:

> *"In the year 1918, when God destroys the churches wholesale and the church members by millions..."*

The Finished Mystery, 1917, p. 485. Verifiable at: https://archive.org/details/TheFinishedMystery

That event did not occur either.

1925

> *"1925 shall mark the resurrection of the faithful worthies of old, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the faithful prophets of old."*

Millions Now Living Will Never Die, 1920, p. 97. Verifiable at: Millions Now Living Will Never Die : J.F. Rutherford : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

None of that happened.

1975 — The Explicit Expectation and Its Consequences

> *"According to reliable Bible chronology, Adam and Eve were created in 4026 B.C.E., meaning that the sixth thousand-year period of man's existence will end in 1975, with the seventh thousand-year period of human history to begin in the fall of 1975 C.E."*

verificável em:The Removal of Mankind's Chief Disturber — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The organization itself later acknowledged that the expectation of 1975 led members to make concrete life decisions. Verifiable in the official acknowledgment at: Choosing the Best Way of Life — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The "1914 Generation" as a Declared Time Limit

"The facts show that this is a limited period, with a definite beginning and a definite end. It began in 1914... There are still people alive who were alive in 1914... 'This generation will by no means pass away until all these things occur.'"

Verifiable directly on the WOL at:The Last Days of This Wicked System of Things — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The Watchtower's own reference work established clear limits:

> *"When the term 'generation' is used with reference to people of a particular time... the life span of such persons would fall within reasonable limits... perhaps 70 or 80 years."*

Verificavel em Generation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

If the generation associated with 1914 were understood within those parameters, the maximum deadline would extend to around 1994.
After that period:

“Jehovah's people, eagerly desiring to see the end of this wicked system, have sometimes speculated about when the “great tribulation” would break out, even relating this to calculations of the life span of a generation from 1914.”

Verifiable at:It Is Time to Be Alert — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Redefinition of the Concept of "Generation"
After the deadline was surpassed, the term began to be associated with a specific group of anointed ones:

"As a group, these anointed ones make up the modern-day 'generation' of contemporaries that will not pass away... Can we determine the length of this period?... We cannot pinpoint the exact length of this period."

Verificável diretamente no WOL em: What Does the Presence of Christ Mean for You? — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

What was defined as a generation with a limit of 70 to 80 years becomes, after the failure of the expectation, a period of indefinite and unspecifiable duration. This is not revision with acknowledgment of error — it is ad hoc redefinition of a concept to preserve the continuity of institutional authority.

Investigative Questions Arising from the Documents Themselves

How does the organization itself define the conduct of false prophets?

> *"Jehovah... will put all false prophets to shame either by not fulfilling the false prediction... False prophets will try to hide their reasons for feeling shame, namely, their failure to speak in Jehovah's name."*

Paradise Restored to Mankind — By Theocracy!, 1972, p. 354.
Paradise Restored to Mankind—By Theocracy! (Book) — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
disponível para download no Archive.org:
https://archive.org/details/paradiserestored0000theo

How did the Watchtower respond to the accusation of false prophecy?

> *"Jehovah's Witnesses... have made errors in their understanding of what would occur at the end of certain time periods. But in making such mistakes they have not... claimed that their predictions were "in the name of Jehovah.""*

Awake!, March 22, 1993, p. 4. Verifiable at:
Why So Many False Alarms? — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This statement is in direct tension with what the same organization had published in 1972: "This 'prophet' was... the people known today as Jehovah's Christian Witnesses." And with the criterion the organization itself had established for others:
Verfidicavel em: **False Prophets Today — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY**

> **"Prova o não cumprimento dessas predições que os que as fizeram eram falsos profetas, em conformidade com Deuteronômio 18:20-22?"**

Verifiable at: Why So Many False Alarms? — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

Who Translated the New World Translation?

The NWT was produced by a committee under the direct responsibility of the Watch Tower Society, whose members the organization chose to keep anonymous.
Verifiable source regarding the anonymity: New World Bible Translation Committee — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
Second verifiable source: New World Translation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY
Despite the institutional anonymity, historical records and sworn testimony make it possible to identify the main individuals involved: Frederick William Franz, Nathan Homer Knorr, Albert D. Schroeder, George D. Gangas, and Milton G. Henschel. The official transcript of the Walsh Trial, in which Frederick W. Franz is identified and examined under oath, is available at: https://archive.org/details/WalshTrial

Of these, only Frederick W. Franz claimed to have any formal knowledge of biblical languages. That knowledge was challenged during the Walsh Trial (Scotland, 1954), when Franz, under oath, claimed to know Hebrew and then was unable to translate Genesis 2:4 when the attorney asked him to. The official transcript is available at:
Walsh Trial : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive

This fact does not in itself prove doctrinal error. It establishes something more basic: the NWT was not produced by a committee with academic qualifications meeting the

usual standards of biblical translation, but by religious leaders directly committed to a specific doctrinal system.

There is also a documentable case of imprecise use of an academic source. Israeli Hebraist Benjamin Kedar-Kopf was cited by the Watchtower as positively endorsing the NWT. Subsequently, Kedar-Kopf clarified that he had never endorsed the translation as a whole — his comments were specific and taken out of context. The reader can verify the exact limits of that citation in the organization's reference material: New World Translation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

The Textual Basis and Translation Choices

The New World Translation of the New Testament was built primarily upon the critical text of Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1881). This point is crucial: the textual basis of the NWT is neither sectarian nor anti-Trinitarian. Westcott was a bishop of the Anglican Church; Hort was a member of the same denomination. Neither of them produced their work with the aim of denying the divinity of Christ.

Fontes:
— B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John:
The Gospel According to St. John: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes : Brooke Foss Westcott : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive
— F. J. A. Hort, Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, vol. 1:
https://archive.org/details/LifeAndLettersOfFentonJohnAnthonyHortVol.1ArthurHort1896

This shifts the investigative focus to where it actually belongs: not to the Greek text itself, but to the translation choices made from it. How does a translation claiming to follow a textual basis produced by Trinitarian theologians systematically arrive at anti-Trinitarian conclusions, especially in theologically sensitive passages?

Two examples verifiable by the reader:

Example 1 — John 1:1
Greek text (as per the NWT's official interlinear): καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος
NWT translation: "the Word was a god"
The Greek text itself contains no indefinite article — Koine Greek does not have that element. The insertion of "a" is a translation choice, not a requirement of the text. The reader can verify the Greek directly in the official interlinear: Kingdom Interlinear | Books of the Bible

Example 2 — John 8:58
Greek text: πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγώ εἰμι
NWT translation: "Before Abraham came into existence, I have been."
The verbal form ἐγώ εἰμι is in the present indicative: "I am." The NWT opts for a reformulation in the past tense that avoids that direct reading. The choice affects the identity Jesus claims for himself in this verse.

The Name "Jehovah" in the New Testament

The NWT inserts the name "Jehovah" 237 times in the New Testament. In the corresponding verses, the Greek text — including the interlinear available on the organization's own website — uses the word Kyrios, meaning "Lord." Verifiable at: Kingdom Interlinear | Books of the Bible

The word "Jehovah" does not appear in any of the more than 5,000 known Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. This fact is acknowledged even by researchers who have evaluated the NWT positively in other respects. Researcher Jason BeDuhn classified the insertion of the name "Jehovah" in the New Testament as a "conjectural emendation" — an alteration of the text based on supposition, not on manuscript evidence. Source: Jason BeDuhn, Truth in Translation, 2003. Verifiable at: https://books.google.com/books?id=EgnIp2Bzdi8C"

The organization itself justifies the insertion based on medieval Hebrew versions of the New Testament — documents produced between the 14th and 19th centuries, therefore much later than the original Greek manuscripts. Verifiable at: New World Translation — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

In many of those 237 verses, the immediate context of the New Testament indicates that Kyrios refers to Jesus. By systematically replacing Kyrios with "Jehovah" in those contexts, the NWT redirects the referent from Jesus to Jehovah. One verifiable example:

Romans 10:9–13 (NWT)

> *"...if you publicly declare with your mouth that Jesus is Lord... you will be saved... For 'everyone who calls on the name of Jehovah will be saved.'"*

Verse 9 uses Kyrios referring to Jesus as "Lord." Verse 13 uses the same Kyrios, but the NWT translates it as "Jehovah." The same Greek term, in the same paragraph, is translated differently depending on whom it refers to. This inconsistency is systematic, and its effect is to separate, at the textual level, what the original Greek presents in a unified way.

The Blood Transfusion Prohibition

The blood transfusion prohibition is one of the best-known teachings of Jehovah's Witnesses and one of those with the most direct and verifiable consequences in the real lives of its members. It will be examined by the same method applied throughout: what is the textual claim, what does the text actually say, when was the doctrine formulated, and what does the historical record reveal about possible internal inconsistencies.

The Alleged Textual Basis
A proibição se baseia em três passagens principais:

Genesis 9:4 (NWT): "Only flesh with its life — its blood — you must not eat."
Leviticus 17:14 (NWT): "...you must not eat the blood of any sort of flesh, because the life of every sort of flesh is its blood."
Acts 15:28–29 (NWT): "...to abstain... from blood..."

The investigative question is strictly textual: what does the Hebrew in these verses prohibit?

O verbo hebraico utilizado em Gênesis 9:4 e Levítico 17:14 é **akhal** — meaning to eat, to consume by mouth. The context of both verses is dietary: regulations regarding the ingestion of animal flesh. Blood transfusion is not ingestion. Physiologically, a transfusion introduces blood directly into the bloodstream, where it functions as blood — it is not digested, metabolized as food, or passed through the gastrointestinal system. The very terms of the text do not describe that process.

Atos 15:28–29 aparece no contexto do Concílio de Jerusalém, onde os apóstolos estabeleceram diretrizes para crentes gentios. O texto diz para "abster-se do sangue", mas o contexto imediato lista essa instrução junto com "abster-se de coisas sacrificadas a ídolos" e "de fornicação", todas claramente no contexto de práticas cultuais e morais, não de procedimentos médicos desconhecidos no século I d.C. A transfusão de sangue como prática médica não existia naquele período histórico. Verifiable at:
https://www.jw.org/pt/biblioteca/biblia/biblia-estudo/livros/atos/15/

When the Doctrine Was Formulated
The Organization of Jehovah's Witnesses has existed since 1870. Blood transfusion as a medical procedure has existed since the 17th century. Yet the specific prohibition against transfusion was introduced only in July 1945, in an article published in The Watchtower (The Watchtower, July 1, 1945, pp. 198–201).

This fact is confirmed by multiple independent academic sources, including an article published in the peer-reviewed journal Social Science & Medicine: "Since 1945, the Watch Tower Society has instructed its followers to refuse transfusions of whole blood and certain blood components." Source: Singelenberg R., Social Science & Medicine, 1990. Available at: The blood transfusion taboo of Jehovah's Witnesses: Origin, development and function of a controversial doctrine - ScienceDirect

A review article published in the open-access journal BMC Medical Ethics confirms: "The church organisation, the Watchtower Society, introduced the policy on refusal of blood in 1945." Source: Bioethical aspects of the recent changes in the policy of refusal of blood by Jehovah's Witnesses - PMC

The question this fact raises is methodologically precise: if the verses from Genesis, Leviticus, and Acts existed since the organization's founding in 1870, and if transfusion as a medical procedure had been known for centuries, why does the specific prohibition emerge only in 1945 — more than 75 years after the founding of the movement?

The Revision Timeline — The Internal Contradiction
Since 1945, the doctrine has undergone a series of revisions that are, in themselves, a relevant investigative fact:

1961 — The organization begins applying the penalty of disfellowshipping (expulsion) for members who accept transfusions.

Verifiable at: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/
1967 — Organ transplants are prohibited as "cannibalism."
Verifiable in the organization's own publication at: Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

1980 — Organ transplants are permitted again, without explicit acknowledgment of the prior error. Verifiable at: Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

From the 1990s onward — Blood fractions (albumin, immunoglobulins, hemoglobin) are progressively permitted as individual "conscience decisions." Verifiable at:Readers' Questions — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

2000 — The organization issues a directive declaring it will no longer formally initiate the disfellowshipping process for accepting a transfusion, though a member who accepts one "indicates that he no longer wishes to be one of Jehovah's Witnesses."
Verifiable at: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/

The internal logical contradiction is precise: if the principle is that blood is sacred and cannot be used because Scripture so determines, why are fractions of that same blood permitted as a personal choice? Fractionated blood is the same blood. The line between "prohibited" and "permitted" does not come from the text — it comes from successive institutional decisions that subsequently seek support in the same verses.

Real-Life Consequences
The transfusion prohibition is not an abstract matter. Children have died. Adults have refused treatment and died. Courts in different countries have been called upon to decide the conflict between religious autonomy and the protection of life, especially that of minors.

A review article published in the journal Postgraduate Medical Journal, accessible via PubMed Central, examines the ethical and legal aspects of these situations in an international context: Ethical and legal aspects of refusal of blood transfusions by Jehovah's Witnesses, with particular reference to Italy - PMC

The Two-Witness Policy and Child Sexual Abuse

Dentro da estrutura congregacional das Testemunhas de Jeová, casos de alegado pecado grave, incluindo abuso sexual, são tratados internamente por um comitê judicial composto exclusivamente por anciãos homens. Esse sistema não reporta casos às autoridades civis, mas trata a questão como um assunto espiritual a ser resolvido dentro da congregação. Para que uma alegação progrida nesse sistema, a organização aplica o princípio dos dois testemunhas, derivado de Deuteronômio 19:15 (TNM):

"On the testimony of two witnesses or three witnesses the matter should be established."

This means in practice: if a child alleges having been abused by a member of the congregation, and the accused denies it, and there is no second eyewitness to the

abuse — which is nearly universally the case, as child sexual abuse occurs precisely in private — the allegation cannot proceed in the internal system. The case is closed and, in the organization's own terminology, left "in Jehovah's hands."

The Textual Basis and Its Original Context

Deuteronomy 19:15 appears in a context of civil legal disputes between adults in ancient Israelite society. The verse concerns establishing guilt in general conflicts between adult members of the community — not sexual crimes against children, a category in which by nature a second witness almost never exists. Applying a criterion designed for disputes between adults to situations where the only possible witness is the child itself does not derive from the text — it derives from an institutional decision of interpretation.

The Australian Royal Commission itself, when examining this practice, noted that the rule *"foi concebida há mais de 2.000 anos"* e que sua aplicação inflexível a casos de abuso sexual infantil demonstra *"grave falta de compreensão da natureza do abuso sexual infantil."* Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

What the Historical Record Documents

In 2015, the Australian government established the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse — a formal, public investigation conducted under oath, with powers equivalent to a court. Case Study No. 29 specifically investigated the practices of Jehovah's Witnesses. The findings are available in the official document at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/case-studies/case-study-29-jehovahs-witnesses

The documented findings include:

— The organization held internal files with records of sexual abuse allegations involving 1,006 members over decades. Of those 1,006 cases, not one had been reported to police by the organization's leadership. The Commission referred information about 514 alleged perpetrators directly to police. Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

— A Comissão concluiu que *"children are not adequately protected from the risk of child sexual abuse in the Jehovah's Witnesses organisation"* e que a organização *"não responde adequadamente a alegações de abuso sexual infantil."* Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

— The internal disciplinary system conducted by the elders is not oriented toward the protection of the child or the survivor. Penalties are weak, with little consideration given to the risk of reoffending by the perpetrator. The victim has little or no choice over how their complaint is handled.

— After receiving the Commission's recommendations — including the revision of the two-witness policy in child abuse cases — the organization refused to modify its position, declaring that it considers the Scriptures to prohibit any change in the application of the rule. Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

The Tension with the Biblical Text the Organization Itself Uses

A mesma organização que aplica Deuteronômio 19:15 de forma inflexível em casos de abuso infantil utiliza os ensinamentos de Jesus como base moral de seu sistema. Jesus, nos Evangelhos registrados na própria TNM, é apresentado como especialmente preocupado com a proteção de crianças. Mateus 18:1–6 (TNM) registra que Jesus disse ser melhor que uma pedra de moinho fosse pendurada no pescoço de quem fizer tropeçar *"um destes pequeninos."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/40/18

Disfellowshipping — Institutional Control and Textual Basis

The practice of disfellowshipping — the formal expulsion of a member from the congregation — is presented by the organization as based on specific biblical texts. Its practical consequences, however, go far beyond what those texts describe.

The Alleged Texts

1 Coríntios 5:11–13 (TNM): *"...não associeis com ninguém que se chame irmão, mas que seja um fornicário, ou ganancioso... com tal homem não comais sequer... Expulsem o iníquo dentre vocês."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/46/5

2 João 10 (TNM): *"Se alguém vier a vocês e não trouxer este ensino, nunca o recebam em suas casas..."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/b/r5/lp-t/nwtsty/63/1

The Investigative Question:

1 Corinthians 5 deals with a specific case of serious sexual immorality within the Corinthian congregation. Paul is responding to a concrete and singular situation. The instruction not to eat with such a person is contextualized within the community of faith — it does not include instruction to cut contact with non-member relatives, with children, with parents. Paul, in the same chapter, verse 10, explicitly clarifies he is not speaking about the world in general.

2 John 10 deals specifically with not hosting or greeting teachers who do not bring the teaching of Christ — that is, false teachers who deny the incarnation of Christ. The verse is about doctrinal protection of the community against external influences, not about ostracizing members who disagree with prophetic chronologies or who simply decide to leave the organization.

The Practical Extent of the Doctrine

In the organization's application, disfellowshipping is applied in situations that go far beyond what the above texts describe.

Documented situations include:

Apostasia — questionar ou rejeitar ensinamentos da organização: The organization itself compares apostate thinking to *"gangrena mortífera"* e descreve a desassociação como a única alternativa: *"A amputação de tal membro pode ser a única alternativa para proteger os outros membros do corpo."* Verifiable at: ‘Não seja depressa demovido de sua razão’ — BIBLIOTECA ON-LINE da Torre de Vigia

Imoralidade sexual: *"Os que também cometem adultério e são impenitentes são desassociados pelas congregações das Testemunhas de Jeová."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1101993015

Simplesmente deixar de ser Testemunha: a saída voluntária é tratada como desassociação automática, com as mesmas consequências do disfellowshipping. Confirmado no artigo peer-reviewed do BMJ que cita a declaração oficial da própria organização: *"tanto os desassociados quanto os desvinculados são considerados proscritos. Em ambos os casos, a comunidade religiosa deve evitá-los."* Verifiable at: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/

The Practical Result: Decades of Family Ostracism.

Once expelled, the official instruction was clear: congregation members — including relatives not living in the same household — were to completely avoid the expelled person.

Verifiable at: When a Relative Is Disfellowshipped . . . — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

. A Sentinela de 15 de setembro de 1981 estabelecia essa posição de forma explícita: *"Nós não nos associamos com desassociados, quer para atividades espirituais, quer sociais."* Verifiable at: How to View Disfellowshipping — Watchtower ONLINE LIBRARY

This instruction was reaffirmed and applied for more than forty years, throughout the 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s. During that period, families were separated out of obedience to this institutional policy. Children cut off contact with parents. Parents cut off contact with children. Spouses were left in impossible situations.

In 2023, the organization partially revised this guidance, allowing basic family contact in specific situations with expelled relatives. This revision is itself a relevant investigative fact: it confirms that the prior practice existed, was institutional, and affected real families for more than four decades before being modified.

The question this history raises is the same that emerges at other points in this investigation: if the practice was sufficiently problematic to be revised in 2023, what does that imply about the decades in which it was applied as instruction of divine origin, and about the families that were destroyed in obedience to it?

The Internal Contradiction

The organization teaches that each person is individually accountable to Jehovah for their decisions. Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/2006206

But the mechanism of disfellowshipping transfers that responsibility to the institution: it is the organization that determines who is "in" and who is "out," and that instructs members — including relatives — on how to treat the expelled. The personal cost of disagreeing or leaving — loss of the entire family and social network built within the organization — functions as a retention mechanism independent of any theological argument.

The Historical Precedence of Doctrine over Translation — The Complete Pattern

This is the final section of the investigation. It introduces no new cases — it closes the argument that the three blocks have built progressively. Everything examined so far — the textual tensions of the NWT, the attributes of nature applied to Jesus, the prophetic claim, the unfulfilled predictions, the transfusion prohibition, the two-witness policy, the disfellowshipping — converges on a single question that this section answers with historical precision.

That question is not theological. It is not about which translation is more faithful. It is not about which interpretation is more correct. It is a simple question of historical order, answerable with verifiable documents:

Did the New World Translation give rise to the theology of Jehovah's Witnesses — or did the theology of Jehovah's Witnesses give rise to the New World Translation?

The answer determines everything. If the translation came first and the theology was built from it, the system is intellectually honest — even if debatable. If the theology came first and the translation was produced to sustain it, the system operates in the opposite direction from what it claims: it is not the text that governs the doctrine, but the doctrine that governs the text.

The Historical and Documentable Answer

The Origin of the Movement — Decades Before the NWT

The organization itself confirms in its online library that its modern history begins in 1870, with Charles Taze Russell and a Bible study group in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

"1870 — Charles Taze Russell e um grupo de Pittsburgh e Allegheny, Pensilvânia, EUA, iniciam estudo sistemático da Bíblia." Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/en/wol/d/r1/lp-e/1101993046

And confirms that the central theological conclusions were formed in that same period:

"A história moderna das Testemunhas de Jeová começou há mais de cem anos. No início da década de 1870, um grupo de estudo bíblico bastante discreto começou

em Allegheny, Pensilvânia, EUA... Charles Taze Russell foi o principal promotor do grupo." Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/en/wol/d/r1/lp-e/1102000101

Nesse período, décadas antes da TNM, já estavam estabelecidas as conclusões centrais: rejeição da Trindade, negação da divindade plena de Cristo, identificação de Jesus como ser criado, interpretação do espírito santo como força impessoal, uso de cronologia profética com datas específicas.

Between 1870 and the mid-20th century, Russell, Rutherford, and the movement's early leaders used the King James Version, the American Standard Version, and other translations produced by Trinitarian committees. Those translations were not created to deny the Trinity. Yet the anti-Trinitarian conclusions were already fully formed. The theology of Jehovah's Witnesses was not born from an anti-Trinitarian translation. It was born despite the existing translations.

A Tradução do Novo Mundo começa a ser publicada apenas a partir de 1950 — Novo Testamento — com a Bíblia completa em 1961. A própria organização confirma esse dado: *"Em 1950, foi publicada a Tradução do Novo Mundo das Escrituras Gregas Cristãs."* Verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1101990133

This means more than 75 years separate the formation of the movement's central theology and the publication of the translation that today sustains it.

The same pattern repeats in every doctrine examined in this block:

The blood transfusion prohibition did not exist before 1945 — more than 75 years after the founding of the movement and centuries after the verses that sustain it were written. The doctrine emerges in 1945; the texts of Genesis and Leviticus are then invoked to support it. Confirmed by a peer-reviewed article: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1119307/

The two-witness policy applied to sexual abuse does not follow from a natural reading of Deuteronomy 19:15 in context. It follows from an institutional decision to interpret a verse about civil disputes between adults as applicable to sexual crimes against children — with consequences documented by a governmental royal commission in 1,006 cases not reported to police. Verifiable at: https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/media-releases/report-jehovahs-witness-organisations-released

conceito de "geração de 1914" foi definido pela própria organização com prazo de 70 a 80 anos, verificável em: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1200001648 — then surpassed, then redefined as a "period of indefinite duration," verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/2008125 — without acknowledgment of error, only with new terminology.

Disfellowshipping with total family ostracism was applied for more than forty years as official instruction, verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1981688 — and partially revised in 2023, without explicit acknowledgment that families were destroyed by decades of obedience to that policy.

The Flow This Chronology Reveals

O fluxo saudável em estudos bíblicos responsáveis é: *texto → exegese → teologia*

O fluxo histórico observável e documentado no caso das Testemunhas de Jeová é: *teologia → releitura → tradução/doutrina → confirmação da teologia*

This does not automatically invalidate every verse of the New World Translation, nor every person who uses it sincerely. But it compromises the neutrality of the translation as a project and the authority of the organization as the exclusive interpreter of the Scriptures — especially when that same organization claims to be the only channel of communication between God and humanity, verifiable at: https://wol.jw.org/pt/wol/d/r5/lp-t/1972241

CLOSING

The Final Question:
Does the New World Translation and the teachings that accompany it reflect the biblical text — or does it reflect the need to preserve a doctrinal system formulated in the 19th century and progressively consolidated throughout the 20th?
This investigation does not force an answer. It only organized the facts, preserved the original words, provided verifiable sources, and allowed the biblical criterion itself — the criterion the organization itself acknowledges — to do its work.
O que cada leitor fará com isso pertence a ele. Mas há uma pergunta que essa evidência deixa no ar, não sobre doutrina, não sobre denominação, mas sobre o próprio ato de crer: Sócrates dizia que a vida não examinada não vale a pena ser vivida. Talvez o mesmo valha para a fé. Não porque examinar destrua, mas porque o que não suporta exame já estava destruído antes de você olhar.